



Harness Dickey & Pierce PLC  
Attorneys and Counselors  
5445 Corporate Drive, Suite 400  
Troy, Michigan 48068-2683  
Phone: 248-641-1600 Fax: 248-641-0270  
Metropolitan: Detroit St. Louis Washington, DC

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 13 2006

DATE: ~~April 12, 2006~~ April 13, 2006

NO. OF PAGES (INCLUDING THIS PAGE): 3

FOR: Chad Zhong

COMPANY: U.S.P.T.O.

FAX NO.: ~~-703-872-9306~~ 571-273-3946 PHONE: ~~571-272-3946~~

ORIGINAL WILL FOLLOW BY:

- ☐ REGULAR MAIL  
☐ OVERNIGHT MAIL  
☐ COURIER  
☒ WILL NOT FOLLOW

FROM: Timothy D. MacIntyre

Attorney Docket #9432-000238

Please let us know by phone or fax if you do not receive any of these pages.

COMMENTS:

Mr. Zhong,

Pursuant to our recent conversation, enclosed is an applicant-initiated interview request. Please contact me at your earliest convenience to let me know whether you are willing to grant an interview concerning application number 10/614,542.

Best regards,  
Timothy D. MacIntyre

Direct phone number: (248) 641-1230

NOTICE

The information contained in this fax transmission is intended only for the individual to whom or entity to which it is addressed. It may also contain privileged, confidential, attorney work product or trade secret information which is protected by law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or an employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the addressee, the reader is hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify us by telephone and return the original message to us at the address above via the U.S. Postal Service. We will reimburse you for any reasonable expense (including postage) for the return of the original message.

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 13 2006

## Applicant Initiated Interview Request

Application No.: 10/614,542                      First Named Applicant: S. Chen  
Examiner:                      C. Zhong                      Art Unit: 2152  
Status of the Application: pending final Office Action

## Issues to be Discussed:

Amendments to traverse 35 USC § 101 rejection with respect to Claims 20 and 22.

Applicants may add "for processing by a computer" after "embodied in a carrier wave."

Amendments to traverse 35 USC § 112 rejection with respect to Claims 32, 35, 37, 38, 43, 44, and 45. Applicants may modify language of Claims 35, 37, 43, and 45 to conform to the language of the specification (paragraphs 22, 24, 27, and 29): "updating" an indicator. The header length field is one example of an indicator disclosed in the specification. Claims 38 and 44 may be cancelled. Applicants assert that Claim 32 does contain subject matter described in the specification. Specifically, paragraph 29 describes an indicator within the options field, as Claim 32 recites: "if the data packet does include at least one destination address in the destination address option."

Discussion of 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection. The limitations of Claim 8 are not taught by Park. Park only allows for swapping addresses, which does not allow for more than one address to be stored in the options field. The invention described by Park will not function with more than one layer of private network translation. Frietsch does not remedy this deficiency.

Regarding Claim 13, Park does not disclose placing the router's address into the source address field of a packet. Instead, Park simply swaps the contents of the address field with the contents of a portion of the options field. Because of this, a sending device in Park needs to know beforehand what the router's address is.

Park does not disclose the subject matter of Claim 24. Park does not disclose a traversable network address residing in an options field of an IP packet header, as Claim 24 recites. Even if Park discloses a public interface IP address and a private interface IP address,

they will never be concatenated together within the options field. Instead, one will reside in the options field and one will reside in the address field (whether source or destination address), while Park swaps them back and forth.

Discussion of 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection. Claim 17 is not obvious in light of Frietsch. The examiner asserts that a tracking mechanism would improve the monitoring capabilities of Park. Even if this were true, Claim 17 does not recite a mechanism for tracking the public routers encountered by a packet, as described by Frietsch. Instead, Claim 17 recites storing the source address of a packet into a list within the options field of the packet, and replacing the source address of the packet with the address of the router.

Frietsch teaches a method of tracking the public addresses of routers that a packet encounters within the public internet. This creates a list of public addresses, while the source and destination of the packet remains the same.

The present invention, however, provides a way that a stack of destination addresses can be stored in a packet (within the options field), which is then used to direct the packet from the public internet through layers of private networks to the ultimate destination. At each layer, the next destination address is popped from the stack and placed in the destination address field.

The present invention also allows for the formation of such a stack of addresses as a packet makes its way through layers of private networks to the public internet. This stack can then be used as a destination stack by a return packet. To create this stack, the source address field is pushed onto the stack as the packet arrives at each private network router, and the source address field is replaced with the address of the private network router.